LYNDHURST - 1975 COMBUNE TOTALS - TRUCKS - CU.YOU TOUNAGE

	1	1111		من ورجيس	<i>אבוופ</i> ל	CUBE		21
	1 1	11		TRUCKS	AVEZAGE	Viagos	- 2000 /55. 1	cu.40
	MONTH	DA	1111			7/7/05	2039/25.	
				$\{-\frac{1}{4},$		$\ + + + + + $		
	JANUARY	_ - -	124	7301	1 350	208511	49241	5035G
	1					111:11		
!	FEBRUARY	11	24	6444	268	185395	43783	المراجين
			1111					
	MARCH		17G	7757	299	230255	5200g	5-1017
· 	2	<u> </u>	1:1		i i	<u> </u>		· \ \
į	APRIL		126	1 8 70 5	343	24648	57685	1044
-						106999		
	MAY		126	16603	254	163654	136942	2775
	/			1-1-1-1-1-1				
	- JUNE		141	5502	1 220	128739	30214	31350
		_		11111				
<u> </u>	· JULY		76	5609	26	134558	31567	32-819
			1111					
<u></u>	AUG		26	513.95	1 1 207	128058	30001	الباواداوا ا
						1		
-	SEPT		7/9	· 555	ע נבי	177775	30035	31-15-
<u> </u>					<u> </u>			
	Oct.		177	1.15717	220	139020	32679	3372
		-		1 100 0				1 3 2
-	Noi.			1 4909	205	121405	25763	1 27601
<u></u>								
i	Dac		13	15201	11193	128227	30/07	3/275
	1							
		-	1111				1-11111	
						1676	453320	
3	9							
0								
				111111				
		· · · ·	i					
: [aladad	
4!	di							
٠,	1 1							
:	;		111			198		
)7·1								4.41
311			:-					
				; <u> </u> - <u>-</u> ,		II		
eri	1	. !!	1 1	1 1 1 1 1 1				ililli
		1	. !					6

FREDERIC C. RITGER, JR. An Attorney at Law 106 Valley Street South Orange, New Jersey 07079 (201) 762-3023

NEW JERSEY BOARD OF PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS

1

IN THE MATTER OF THE SCHEDULES FILED BY BERGEN COUNTY SANITARY LANDFILL DEPARTMENT, COUNTY OF BERGEN, INCREASING RATES AND CHARGES FOR SANITARY LANDFILL SERVICE.

DOCKET NO. 7612-1187

DOCKET NO. 724-360 711-16

IN THE MATTER OF THE DISPOSITION OF AN ESCROW ACCOUNT AND INCREASES IN RATES BY BERGEN COUNTY LANDFILL.

EXCEPTIONS TO EXAMINERS
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Intervenors; Capasso Brothers, Impac Inc., Ralph Marangi, Inc., Joe Di Rese & Sons, O. Schaper Disposal, Vito Stamato & Co., Inc. and W. A. Carey, et als, submit herewith the following exceptions to the Report and Recommendation of the Hearing Examiner, dated March 31, 1978 and served upon the attorney for the intervenors on April 20, 1978.

1. In the interest of brevity and rather than to complicate the issues before this Board, the Intervenors adopt the arguments of Rate Counsel as filed in Rate Counsel's Brief dated July 18, 1977, and further, adopts the Exceptions of the Intervenors C & A Carbone Private Sanitation of New Jersey, Inc., et als insofar as such Brief and Exceptions

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the undersigned on behalf of Impac, Inc., a corporation of the State of New Jersey, Route 17-S-122, Paramus, New Jersey 07652; William A. Carey Company, Inc., a corporation of the State of New Jersey, 80 Liberty Street, Passaic, New Jersey 07055; Ralph Marangi, Inc., a corporation 10 of the State of New Jersey, 315 14th Street, Carlstadt, New Jersey 07022; Schaper Disposal Works, Inc., a corporation of the State of New Jersey, 101 Midland Avenue, Midland Park, New Jersey 07432; Vito Stamato & Co., Inc., a corporation of the State of New Jersey, 76 Sidney Street, Lodi, New Jersey 07644; L. Pucillo & Sons, Inc., a corporation of the State of New Jersey, Route 46, Lodi, New Jersey 07644; 3-D Services Co., Inc., a corporation of the State of New Jersey, 319 Pleasant Avenue, 30 Hackensack, New Jersey 07601; Browning-Ferris Industries of North Jersey, Inc. (formerly Pinrose Co., Inc.), a corporation of the State of New Jersey, 54 Montesano Road, Fairfield, New Jersey 07006; A.A. Mastrangelo, Inc., a corporation of the State of New Jersey, 756 Fairview Avenue, Fairview, New Jersey 07022; 40 Joe DiRese & Sons, Inc., a corporation of the State of New Jersey, P.O. Box 78, Cresskill, New Jersey 07626; Capasso Bros., a partnership, 118 Prospect Street, Ridgewood, New Jersey 07451, appellants, APPEALS to the Superior Court of New Jersey, Appellate

Division from the Order entered by the Board of Public Utility

Commissioners on June 8, 1978 and served upon the attorney for
the appellants on June 26, 1978, by which Order the Board
adopted the hearing examiner's report and recommendation issued

March 31, 1978 granting Bergen County a rate increase for
sanitary landfill services determining rate base, cost of
capital, required return, test year deficit, revenue deficiency,
total revenue requirement and estimated tariff cost per cubic
yard and disposition of principal and interest in certain funds
collected by Bergen County and required by Order of the Superior

Court of New Jersey to be held by Bergen County in escrow from

January, 1971 through the date of the Order of the Board of

Public Utility Commissioners.

The appellants joined in a motion for rehearing and
reconsideration pursuant to N.J.A.C. 14:1-14.1 on July 8, 1978
addressed to the Order of the Board of Public Utility
Commissioners as aforesaid. The Board of Public Utility
Commissioners, not having acted upon the aforesaid motion within 40
60 days, it is deemed denied, N.J.A.C. 14:1-14.2(c).

is true control of the control of th

FREDERIC C. RITGER, JR. Attorney for above-named appellants.

MTED: October 19, 1978

124a

50

NOTICE is hereby given that A. Capone Sanitation, a corporation of the State of New Jersey, with offices at 178 River Street, Paterson, New Jersey; C & A Carbone Private Sanitation of New Jersey, Inc., a corporation of the State of New Jersey, with offices at Page & Schuyler Avenues, Lyndhurst, New Jersey; Carmine Franco & Co., Inc., a corporation 10 of the State of New Jersey, with offices at 131 Patterson Street, Hillsdale, New Jersey; J. Cilano Sanitation Service, a corporation of the State of New Jersey, with offices at 19 Ise Street, South Hackensack, New Jersey; DiBella Sanitation, a corporation of the State of New Jersey, with its offices at 87 Madison Avenue, Park Ridge, New Jersey; M & A Franco Sanitation, a corporation of the State of New Jersey, with offices at 14 Hillsdale Terrace, Lodi, New Jersey; Marangi Bros., Inc., a corporation of the State of New Jersey, with offices at 408 Patton Place, Wyckoff, New Jersey; Modern Industrial Waste Service, a corporation of the State of New Jersey, with offices at 251 Second Street, Saddle Brook, New Jersey; Piccini Sanitation, Inc., a corporation of the State of New Jersey, with offices at 23 Grove Street, Waldwick, New Jersey; Pinto Services, a corporation of the State of New Jersey, with offices at 41 Church Street, Lodi, New Jersey; Policastro Service, Inc., a corporation of New Jersey, with offices at 68 Richard Street, Parsippany, New Jersey; Round Lake Sanitation Corp., a corporation of the

128a

State of New Jersey, with offices at Lake Road, Monroe, New York; A. Rizzo Carting, with offices at 1378 Ratzer Road, Wayne, New Jersey; Fiorillo Bros., a corporation of the State of New Jersey, with offices at Page & Schuyler Avenue, Lyndhurst, New Jersey; Mario's Fortable Service, Inc., a corporation of the State of New Jersey, with offices at 288 Paterson Plank Road, East Rutherford, New Jersey; Jersey Carting, Inc., a corporation of the State of New Jersey, with offices at 288 Paterson Plank Road, East Rutherford, New Jersey; Nicholas Sanitation, a corporation of the State 20 of New Jersey, with offices at 27 Iowa Avenue, Paterson, New Jersey; Torino Disposal Service, a corporation of the State of New Jersey, with offices at 239 Beech Court, River Edge, New Jersey, Appellants, appeal to the Appellate Division from the whole of the Order entered by the Board of Public 30 Utility Commissioners on June 8, 1978 and served upon the attorney for the Appellants, June 26, 1978 by which Order the Board adopted the Hearing Examiner's Report and Recommendation, issued March 31, 1978 granting Bergen County a rate increase for sanitary landfill services, determining rate base, cost of capital, required return, test year deficit, revenue deficiency, total revenue requirement and estimated tariff cost per cubic yard and disposition of principal and interest in a certain escrow funds collected by Bergen County from users of the sanitary landfill from January 1971 through the

129a

Mr. James Murphy, Principal Environmental Engineer for the County of Bergen, testified at length as to the Bergen County Landfill and its equipment. [1T 14-19; 3T 71-112].

The County of Bergen operated refuse disposal sites through the Bergen County Sanitary Landfill Department since 1958. These sites were located in Lyndhurst, New Jersey and the Overpeck area adjacent to Teaneck, New Jersey. [1T 16-17]. The Overpeck site was closed in May 1975 [1T 18, 3T 72], and all remaining equipment utilized at the Overpeck Landsite was transferred to the Lyndhurst site for use there. [3T 97].

While the record indicates that there was a scope of reduction in the scale of operations at Lyndhurst [3T 76], the following testimony indicates that the additional equipment was both needed and utilized there:

First, the Lyndhurst site was more difficult to operate.

The slopes and depth of the refuse was great and required greater utilization of equipment [3T 79-80].

Second, in 1975, the Department of Environmental
Protection ordered changes to take place at Lyndhurst in order
to conform to its regulations. [3T 87-89]. In order to conform
to those regulations, additional equipment was needed at Lyndhurst
and the Overpeck equipment was utilized. [3T 91-92].

Third, this equipment was necessary both to correct past violations and to conform to those regulations in the continued operation of the landfull. [3T 99]. The additional equipment is used to cover refuse with dirt as required by the Department of Environmental Protection [3T 103], and for maintenance of roads. The additional equipment enabled the County to prepare for the following day during operating hours as set forth by the Department of Environmental Protection and also eliminated the need for overtime. [3T 103-104]. Thus, the Lyndhurst site, by virtue of the Overpeck equipment, was able to maintain a more efficient operation and one which complied with the standards set forth by the Department of Environmental Protection. [3T 104].

Based upon the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the Board's determination of rate base is fully supported by the record and applicable legal principles. Cf. In re: New Jersey Power & Light Co., supra., 9 N.J. at 523.

B) EXPENSE

It is also well settled in this State that it is equally as important in a proceeding of this nature to determine the reasonableness of the items of expense and income to be allowed in computing the operating and net income of the public utility as it is to determine the rate base to which this net income is applied in the computation of the rate of return.

In re: New Jersey Power & Light Co., supra., 9 N.J. at 525;

Public Service Coordinated Transport v. State, supra., 5 N.J. at 222.

(see Exhibit "C" attached hereto and made a part hereof)
to be applied. Further, the County was been ordered to
show cause why the suspension should not be made permanent
and has set January 21, 1971 as the hearing date.

4. In the Order to Show Cause, the Board of Public Utility Commissioners stated that the County's "...solid waste disposal operations are subject to the jurisdiction of the Board of Public Utility Commissioners pursuant to N.J.S.A. 43:2-13..." (see Exhibit "D" attached hereto and made a part hereof.)

5. The County of Bergen is not subject to the jurisdiction of the Board of Public Utility Commissioners pursuant to N.J.S.A. 43:2-13.

6. The County will suffer i diate, substantial and irreparable injury from the suspension of the rate increase because of the following factual situation:

A large portion of the daily waste disposal is conducted on a cash basis with customers who do not make regular use of the landfill. Further, no record of these cash customers are kept, thus, the County will be unable to recover the difference between the November 6, 1970 rates, which are being applied pursuant to the P.U.C. Order and the rates of January 6, 1971.

Wherefore, plaintiff decands Judgment against defendants as follows:

- (a) Enjoining the defendants from suspending the rates of January 6, 1971, and
- (b) Enjoining the defendants from conducting a Mearing into the reasonableness of the rates on Thursday, January 21, 1971, at 10:30 A.M. Prevailing Time, Room 203, 101 Commerc Street, Newark, New Jersey, and ordering the

BOARD OF PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS
DOCKET NO.

IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF THE COUNTY OF BERGEN FOR AUTHORIZATION TO INCREASE FEES CHARGED FOR DISPOSAL OF HASTE MATERIAL AT THE COUNTY LANDFILLS (FOR 1974)

TO: THE HONORABLE BOARD OF PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSIONERS

Pursuant to the Regulations of the Board of Public Utility
Commissioners, the County of Bergen, a body politic and composate
of the State of New Jersey, hereby petitions the Board of Public
Utility Commissioners, for an Order authorizing an increase in feet
charged for the disposal of waste material at the County Sanitary
Landfills.

Petitioner bases its claim for relief upon the following facts:

- 1. The County first began it sanitary landfill operation in 1952, when an experimental landfill project was set up in the Overpeck area of Teameck, New Jersey. Two communities, Teameck and Leonia, brought refuse to this site. On July 1, 1955, the Overpeck landfill was opened and, subsequently, other sites were opened in Rutherford and Lyndhurst. Today 66 municipalities with a population of nearly 1,000,000 people dispose their refuse at the County's Sanitary Landfill. In addition, private scavengers who have contracts with private Bergen County citizens and compercial and industrial firms in Bergen County use these facilities for the disposal of solid waste from Bergen County only.
- 2. Bergen County's petition for an increase of the 1971 rates is yet unresolved. The hearing examiners report and recommendation were received on Jamery 23, 1974. The County of Bergen thereupon filed exception to the Hearing Examiners' Report. The County, anticipating a response to these exceptions, delayed the filing of this petition. At this time, the County has received no response to the exception.

site? Yes. Sir. The Overpeck site, again for the record, was Q closed in 1975, is that correct? May 8, 1975. 5 And the Public Utility Commission approved Q 6 certain curtailment of service at the Lyndhurst site, is 7 that correct? Yes, Sir. 8 Prior to that Board order, would you tell us the scope and nature of the landfill operations as ran by 10 11 the County, what type of material was taken in, what loca-12 tions and approximately how much material? 13 At the Overpeck site was primarily residential with 14 some trailer loads from the City of Englewood and a minimal number of trucks coming from the commercial-industrial 16 The total tonnage at the Overpeck site at that time ran about 1600 tons a day. 18 And Lyndhurst? Q 19 The Lyndhurst site was primarily commercial-industrial 20 oversized objects, bulky waste, demolition with a minimum of 21 household waste being received and ran approximately 32 to 22 3300 tons a day. EXAMINER MEHR: That first was 1600? THE WITNESS: 25 EXAMINER MEHR: Overpeck was 1600.

As well as the landfill known as the Lyndhurst

Q

	1	Jamuary. That, divided by - I do believe there were 20
	2	working days in January; I am not certain. Yes, 26 working
	. 3	days would give us a daily average, then, at that point. If
	4 5	we still have the calculator, we can work that back. Q Close to 2,000 yards, would you say that would
•**.	б	be fair? A Yes.
	.7.	Q Now, in the course of handling the Overpeck
	8	material, again prior to closure, do you have any figures
	9	which would indicate the number of trucks which would have
	10	delivered the roughly 3800 cubic yards a day?
200	11	A Well, the month of January, 7,301 trucks delivered at
	12	Lyndhurst.
	13	Q How about Overpeck, do you have that?
	14	A Yes, the Overpeck in January was receiving 4,264
A Maria	15	trucks during the month of January on 26 working days.
	16	Q So Lyndhurst would be a daily average of
	17	roughly 280 trucks?
	18	A Yes, that's close. I haven't done the mathematics.
100	19	Q Per day, and Overpeck 164. Would that be?
kan	20	A Yes.
	21	Q Yes? A I will make available to you
	22	the actual records that show this on a per day basis if you
100000000000000000000000000000000000000	23	wish. And the same of the same
27.5	24	Q Well, I believe those figures are reflected
	25	on that exhibit. A Yes, they are, but I haven't
	#7 '	